Her Majesty's Coroner for Inner North London

Our Ref: 48 of December 1964

Your Ref:

12th October 2000

H.M. Coroner's Court
St Pancras
Camley Street
LONDON
NW1 0PP

Tel: 0-20-7387-4884
Fax: 0-20-7383-2485

A Baron
93c, Venner Road
Sydenham
London SE26 5HU

Dear Sir,

Inquest into the death of Volve Katz

I have been directed by the Coroner, Dr Stephen Chan, to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter relating to the death of Volve Katz and reply on his behalf to your enquiry in the following terms.

Dr Chan regrets that he cannot accede to your request to have access to the inquest file relating to Volve Katz's death. Unlike some records, transcripts of evidence, or copies of statements and reports used as evidence at inquests, are only made available on application to "properly interested persons" who are deemed to be

1. Parent, child, spouse or legal representative of the deceased

2. Person who may have responsibility for the death

3. A beneficiary from an insurance policy relating to the deceased

4. Representatives of any relevant insurance company

5. A representative from a relevant trade union (if the death arose in connection with the person's employment or was due to industrial disease)

6. Certain inspectors or representatives of enforcing authorities or persons appointed by a government department

7. The police and

8. Any other persons the Coroner considers to have a legitimate interest for the purposes of the inquest.

The Coroner does not believe your application to be covered by any of the above considerations.

It is in any case doubtful as to whether the file you mention is still in existence. Due to lack of storage space it is the practice of the London Metropolitan Archives, where such files

are kept, to destroy them once a period of 30 years has elapsed since the death was recorded.

It can be confirmed that the inquest was held on 4th December 1964. The cause of Volve Katz's death was confirmed as "carbon monoxide poisoning due to fire fumes" and the Coroner recorded a verdict of "accidental death".

It could be concluded from the wording of the verdict that the Coroner delivering it, having heard the evidence at the inquest, did not consider that the deceased had been the victim of murder or manslaughter.

Yours faithfully,

Martin Leigh
Coroner's Clerk

pp H M Coroner – Dr S M T Chan